

MICRO ELECTRONICS, INC.

BY FEDERAL EXPRESS

June 9, 2008

The Honorable Vincent J. Poppiti
Blank Rome LLP
Chase Manhattan Centre, Suite 800
Wilmington, DE 19801

Re: Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., et al. v. Intel Corporation, et al., CA.A. No. 05-441
JJF - Que Chosir Motion to Intervene and Application Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1782

Dear Judge Poppiti:

Micro Electronics, Inc. ("MEI") submits this letter in opposition to the Motion of Union Federale des Consommateurs – Que Choisir ("QC") in which QC seeks to intervene in this action for the purpose of seeking modifications to the Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Orders entered by the Court on September 26, 2006.

MEI is not a party to this case but is providing Confidential Discovery Material to AMD and Intel in response to third-party subpoenas they issued to MEI in this case in June 2006. MEI is a privately held company. The documents in question include MEI's highly confidential purchasing and sales information, individual customer transaction information, detailed sales forecasting and other trade secrets, the inappropriate disclosure of which would cause great harm to MEI.

In providing such confidential information to AMD and Intel in response to their subpoenas, MEI placed complete reliance on the protections afforded by the Protective Order.

The modifications to the Court's Protective Order sought by QC would jeopardize the confidentiality protections given by the Order, and QC has not shown good cause to move for its modification, as required by section 28 of the Order.

This Court cannot assure that the Protective Order's safeguards would apply to MEI's Confidential Discovery Material if access were to be granted to QC. QU is a foreign non-governmental entity and is outside the jurisdiction of this Court.

As noted in a May 5, 2008 letter to you from Intel counsel Richard Horwitz, QC has not followed the procedures mandated by the European Commission and is attempting to circumvent EC law by directly approaching this Court to obtain documents. QC's desire to advance the interests of its French consumer association members and to do so by

Hon. Vincent J. Poppiti – June 9, 2008

shortcutting EC discovery procedures does not constitute good cause to relax the Protective Order's safeguards and override MEI's justifiable expectations that those safeguards would continue to apply to Confidential Discovery Materials provided by MEI in reliance upon the Protective Order.

Also, it would impose an intolerable burden on MEI to have to undergo the expense of attempting—perhaps in vain—to enforce the confidentiality of its Confidential Discovery Material in tribunals located in other countries lacking reliable safeguards against the types of disclosures that this Court's Protective Order in this case is designed to prohibit.

MEI urges the Court to deny QC's motion to intervene and to modify the Protective Order.

Very truly yours,



T. James Koehler,
Chief Financial Officer,
Micro Electronics, Inc.

Cc: Richard L. Horwitz
Richard A. Ripley
James O. Pearl